

AN EXTENSION THEOREM FOR SEPARATELY MEROMORPHIC FUNCTIONS WITH PLURIPOLAR SINGULARITIES

MAREK JARNICKI AND PETER PFLUG

ABSTRACT. Let $D_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be a pseudoconvex domain and let $A_j \subset D_j$ be a locally pluriregular set, $j = 1, \dots, N$. Put

$$X := \bigcup_{j=1}^N A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1} \times D_j \times A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N.$$

Let $M \subset X$ be relatively closed. For any $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ let Σ_j be the set of all $(z', z'') \in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N)$ such that the fiber $M_{(z', \cdot, z'')} := \{z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j} : (z', z_j, z'') \in M\}$ is not pluripolar. Assume that $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N$ are pluripolar. Put

$$X' := \bigcup_{j=1}^N \{(z', z_j, z'') \in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times D_j \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N) : (z', z'') \notin \Sigma_j\}.$$

Then (Theorem 1.3) there exists a relatively closed pluripolar subset $\widehat{M} \subset \widehat{X}$ of the ‘envelope of holomorphy’ $\widehat{X}$ of X such that:

- $\widehat{M} \cap X' \subset M$,
- every function f separately meromorphic on $X \setminus M$ (Definition 1.2) extends to a (uniquely determined) function $\widehat{f}$ meromorphic on $\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$,
- if f is separately holomorphic on $X \setminus M$, then $\widehat{f}$ is holomorphic on $\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$, and
- $\widehat{M}$ is singular with respect to the family of all functions $\widehat{f}$.

The case of separately holomorphic functions was solved in [Jar-Pfl 2002b]. In the case where $N = 2$, $M = \emptyset$, the above result will be strengthened in Theorem 1.4.

1. INTRODUCTION. MAIN RESULTS.

We keep the main notation from [Jar-Pfl 2002b]:

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32D15, 32D10.

The first author was supported in part by the KBN grant No. 5 P03A 033 21. The paper was finished during the RiP stay of both authors at Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut in Oberwolfach. We like to thank these institutions.

- Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \geq 2$, and let $\emptyset \neq A_j \subset D_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$, where D_j is a domain, $j = 1, \dots, N$. We define an N -fold cross

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \mathbb{X}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N) \\ &:= \bigcup_{j=1}^N A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1} \times D_j \times A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_1 + \dots + n_N} = \mathbb{C}^n. \end{aligned}$$

- For an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ and $A \subset \Omega$ let

$$h_{A,\Omega} := \sup\{u : u \in \mathcal{PSH}(\Omega), u \leq 1 \text{ on } \Omega, u \leq 0 \text{ on } A\},$$

where $\mathcal{PSH}(\Omega)$ is the set of all functions plurisubharmonic on Ω . Put

$$\omega_{A,\Omega} := \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} h_{A \cap \Omega_k, \Omega_k}^*,$$

where $(\Omega_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of relatively compact open sets $\Omega_k \subset \Omega_{k+1} \Subset \Omega$ with $\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty \Omega_k = \Omega$ (h^* denotes the upper semicontinuous regularization of h).

- For an N -fold cross $X = \mathbb{X}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N)$ put

$$\widehat{X} := \{(z_1, \dots, z_N) \in D_1 \times \dots \times D_N : \sum_{j=1}^N \omega_{A_j, D_j}(z_j) < 1\}.$$

- We say that a subset $\emptyset \neq A \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is *locally pluriregular* if $h_{A \cap \Omega, \Omega}^*(a) = 0$ for any $a \in A$ and for any open neighborhood Ω of a .

- Suppose that $S_j \subset (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$. Define the *generalized N -fold cross*

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \mathbb{T}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N; S_1, \dots, S_N) := \bigcup_{j=1}^N \{(z', z_j, z'') \\ &\in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times D_j \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N) : (z', z'') \notin S_j\}. \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

- Let $M \subset T$ be a relatively closed set. We say that a function $f : T \setminus M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is *separately holomorphic* ($f \in \mathcal{O}_s(T \setminus M)$) if for any $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $(a', a'') \in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N) \setminus S_j$ the function $f(a', \cdot, a'')$ is holomorphic in the open set $D_j \setminus M_{(a', \cdot, a'')}$, where $M_{(a', \cdot, a'')} := \{z_j \in \mathbb{C}^{n_j} : (a', z_j, a'') \in M\}$ ⁽²⁾. Notice that the definition applies to the case where $T = X$ is an N -fold cross ($S_1 = \dots = S_N = \emptyset$).

The following general extension theorem for separately holomorphic functions with singularities was proved in [Jar-Pfl 2002a] and [Jar-Pfl 2002b].

Theorem 1.1. *Let $D_j \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_j}$ be a pseudoconvex domain, let $A_j \subset D_j$ be a locally pluriregular set, $j = 1, \dots, N$, and let $M \subset X$ be a relatively closed subset of the N -fold cross $X := \mathbb{X}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N)$. Assume that for each $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$*

⁽¹⁾ Observe that $\mathbb{X}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N) = \mathbb{T}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N; \emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$. Moreover, if $N = 2$, then $\mathbb{T}(A_1, A_2; D_1, D_2; S_1, S_2) = \mathbb{X}(A_1 \setminus S_2, A_2 \setminus S_1; D_1, D_2)$.

⁽²⁾ Observe that the above condition is empty if $M_{(a', \cdot, a'')} = D_j$.

the set $\Sigma_j = \Sigma_j(M)$ of all points $(z', z'') \in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N)$ such that the fiber $M_{(z', \cdot, z'')}$ is not pluripolar is pluripolar. Put

$$X' = X'(M) := \mathbb{T}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N; \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N).$$

Then there exists a relatively closed pluripolar set $\widehat{M} \subset \widehat{X}$ such that:

- $\widehat{M} \cap X' \subset M$,
- for every $f \in \mathcal{O}_s(X \setminus M)$ there exists exactly one $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M})$ with $\widehat{f} = f$ on $X' \setminus M$,
- $\widehat{M}$ is singular with respect to the family $\{\widehat{f} : f \in \mathcal{O}_s(X \setminus M)\}$.

In particular, $\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$ is the envelope of holomorphy of $X \setminus M$ with respect to the space of separately holomorphic functions.

Moreover:

- (a) if M is pluripolar, then $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N$ are pluripolar ⁽³⁾,
- (b) if $M = X \cap \widetilde{M}$, where $\widetilde{M}$ is an analytic subset of an open connected neighborhood of X , then $\widehat{M}$ is analytic,
- (c) if $M = X \cap \widetilde{M}$, where $\widetilde{M}$ is an analytic subset of $\widehat{X}$, then $\widehat{M}$ is the union of all pure $(n-1)$ -dimensional irreducible components of $\widetilde{M}$ ⁽⁴⁾.

Some special cases of the above theorem were studied by many authors — see the references in [Jar-Pfl 2002b].

It is known that the envelope of holomorphy (of any Riemann domain over $\mathbb{C}^n$) coincides with the envelope of meromorphy (cf. [Jar-Pfl 2000], Th. 3.6.6). Thus it is natural to conjecture that in the above situation the domain $\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$ is also the envelope of meromorphy of $X \setminus M$ with respect to separate meromorphic functions. The case $M = \emptyset$ was studied in [Sak 1957], [Kaz 1976], [Kaz 1978], [Kaz 1984], [Shi 1986], and [Shi 1989].

Definition 1.2. Let $T = \mathbb{T}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N; S_1, \dots, S_N)$ be a generalized N -fold cross. Let $M \subset T$, $S \subset T \setminus M$ be relatively closed. We say that a function $f : (T \setminus M) \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is *separately meromorphic on $T \setminus M$* ($f \in \mathcal{M}_s(T \setminus M)$) if for any $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $(a', a'') \in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N) \setminus S_j$ with $(M \cup S)_{(a', \cdot, a'')} \neq D_j$, there exists a function $f(a', \cdot, a'') \in \mathcal{M}(D_j \setminus M_{(a', \cdot, a'')})$ such that $f(a', \cdot, a'') = f(a', \cdot, a'')$ on $D_j \setminus (M \cup S)_{(a', \cdot, a'')}$.

Observe that $f \in \mathcal{O}_s(T \setminus (M \cup S))$ ⁽⁵⁾.

The main results of the paper are the following two theorems.

Theorem 1.3. Let $(A_j, D_j)_{j=1}^N$, X , M , and $\widehat{M}$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Let $S \subset X \setminus M$ be relatively closed and let $f : (X \setminus M) \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a separate meromorphic function on $X \setminus M$ such that

- (*) the sets $\Sigma_1(S), \dots, \Sigma_N(S)$ are pluripolar.

⁽³⁾ And, consequently, the assumption of the theorem is always satisfied for pluripolar sets.

⁽⁴⁾ In particular, $M = \emptyset \implies \widehat{M} = \emptyset$.

⁽⁵⁾ Note that $M \cup S$ is relatively closed in T .

Put $Q_f := M \cup S$. Then there exists exactly one $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M})$ such that:

- $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{Q}_f)$, where the set $\widehat{Q}_f$ is constructed via Theorem 1.1 (in the same way as $\widehat{M}$ for M) ⁽⁶⁾,
- $\widehat{f} = f$ on $X'_f \setminus Q_f$, where

$$X'_f := \mathbb{T}(A_1, \dots, A_N; D_1, \dots, D_N; \Sigma_1(Q_f), \dots, \Sigma_N(Q_f)).$$

Consequently, the envelope of $X \setminus M$ with respect to separately meromorphic functions satisfying $(*)$ coincides with its envelope of separate holomorphy.

In the case where $N = 2$, $M = \emptyset$, the above result may be strengthened as follows.

Theorem 1.4. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^p$, $G \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ be pseudoconvex domains, let $\emptyset \neq A \subset D$, $\emptyset \neq B \subset G$ be locally pluriregular sets, and let

$$X := \mathbb{X}(A, B; D, G) = (A \times G) \cup (D \times B).$$

Let $S \subset X$ be a relatively closed set. Assume that:

(1.4.1) for every $(a, b) \in A \times B$ we have $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}^q} S_{(a, \cdot)} = \emptyset$, $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}^p} S_{(\cdot, b)} = \emptyset$,

(1.4.2) $A \times B \subset \overline{(A \times B) \setminus S}$ ⁽⁷⁾,

there exist exhaustions $(D_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ and $(G_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ of D and G , respectively, such that:

(1.4.3) D_j, G_j are relatively closed pseudoconvex subdomains of D and G , respectively,

(1.4.4) $A_j := A \cap D_j \neq \emptyset$, $B_j := B \cap G_j \neq \emptyset$,

(1.4.5) for every $(a, b) \in A_j \times B_j$ we have $B_j \setminus S_{(a, \cdot)} \neq \emptyset$, $A_j \setminus S_{(\cdot, b)} \neq \emptyset$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$.

Then for every function $f : X \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is separately meromorphic on X there exists a function $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(\widehat{X})$ such that $\widehat{f} = f$ on $X \setminus S$.

2. AUXILIARY RESULTS.

Remark 2.1. (a) ([Kli 1991], Corollary 4.8.4) If $A, B \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ are plurithin at a point $a \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ⁽⁸⁾, then $A \cup B$ is plurithin at a .

(b) ([Arm-Gar 2001], Th. 7.2.2) Every polar set $P \subset \mathbb{C}$ is thin at any point $a \in \mathbb{C}$.

(c) If $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ is not thin at a point $a \in \overline{A}$, then for any polar set $P \subset \mathbb{C}$, the set $A \setminus P$ is not thin at a ((c) follows directly from (a) and (b)).

(d) If $A \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is locally pluriregular at a point $a \in \overline{A}$, then A is not plurithin at a . If $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ is not thin at a point $a \in \overline{A}$, then A is locally regular at a .

⁽⁶⁾ Note that $\widehat{M} \subset \widehat{Q}_f$.

⁽⁷⁾ In particular, for every $(a, b) \in A \times B$ and for every neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{C}^p \times \mathbb{C}^q$ of (a, b) the set $(A \times B) \cap U \setminus S$ is not pluripolar.

⁽⁸⁾ We say that a set $A \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is *plurithin* at a point $a \in \mathbb{C}^n$ if either $a \notin \overline{A}$ or $a \in \overline{A}$ and $\limsup_{A \setminus \{a\} \ni z \rightarrow a} u(z) < u(a)$ for a function u plurisubharmonic in a neighborhood of a .

Indeed, suppose that $A \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is locally pluriregular at a and

$$\limsup_{A \setminus \{a\} \ni z \rightarrow a} u(z) < c < u(a)$$

for some $u \in \mathcal{PSH}(V)$, where V is an open neighborhood of a . We may assume that $u \leq 0$ on V . Take an open neighborhood $U \subset V$ of a such that $u < c$ on $(A \setminus \{a\}) \cap U$. Put $v := \frac{u}{-c} + 1$. Then $v \leq 1$ on U and $v \leq 0$ on $(A \setminus \{a\}) \cap U$. Hence $v \leq h_{(A \setminus \{a\}) \cap U, U}^* = h_{A \cap U, U}^*$ on U . In particular, $0 = v(a) = \frac{u(a)}{-c} + 1 < 0$; contradiction.

Now, suppose that $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ is not thin at a and $h_{A \cap U, U}^*(a) > 0$ for some neighborhood U of a . Let $P \subset U$ be a polar set such that $h_{A \cap U, U}^* = h_{A \cap U, U}$ on $U \setminus P$ (cf. [Jar-Pfl 2000] Th. 2.1.41). In particular, $h_{A \cap U, U}^* = 0$ on $A \setminus P$. By (c), the set $A \setminus P$ is not thin at a . Hence $0 < h_{A \cap U, U}^*(a) = \limsup_{A \setminus P \ni z \rightarrow a} h_{A \cap U, U}^*(z) = 0$; contradiction.

(e) ([Arm-Gar 2001], Th. 7.3.9) If $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ is thin at a point $a \in \overline{A}$, then there is a sequence $r_k \searrow 0$ such that $\{z \in A : |z - a| = r_k\} = \emptyset$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$.

(f) ([Bed-Tay 1982], Corollary 10.5) For a non-pluripolar set $A \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ let A^* denote the set of all $a \in \overline{A}$ such that A is locally pluriregular at a . Then $A \setminus A^*$ is pluripolar.

3. COROLLARIES FROM THEOREM 1.4.

Let E denote the unit disc. For $a \in \mathbb{C}^k$, $r > 0$, let $\Delta_a(r) = \Delta_a^k(r)$ be the polydisc with center at a and the radius r .

Corollary 3.1 (Cf. [Sak 1957]). *Let $S \subset E \times E$ be a relatively closed set such that:*

- $\text{int } S = \emptyset$,
- *for every domain $U \subset E \times E$ the set $U \setminus S$ is connected* ⁽⁹⁾.

Let A (resp. B) denote the set of all $a \in E$ (resp. $b \in E$) such that $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}} S_{(a, \cdot)} = \emptyset$ (resp. $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}} S_{(\cdot, b)} = \emptyset$). Put $X := \mathbb{X}(A, B; E, E) = (A \times E) \cup (E \times B)$.

Then for every function $f : X \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is separately meromorphic on X , there exists an $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(E \times E)$ such that $\hat{f} = f$ on $X \setminus S$.

Remark 3.2. Notice that the original proof of the above result is not correct: the proof of Theorem 1 in [Sak 1957] contains an essential gap. Namely, on p. 78 the author claims that for any domain $U \subset E \times E$ the set $(A \times B) \cap U \setminus S$ contains an open polydisc. The following example shows that this is in general impossible.

Let $(\mathbb{Q} + i\mathbb{Q}) \cap E = \{q_1, q_2, \dots\}$, $S := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{q_k\} \times \overline{\Delta}_{1-1/k}(1/k^2) \subset E \times E$. Then S satisfies all the assumptions of Corollary 3.1 but in this case the interior of $A = E \setminus (\mathbb{Q} + i\mathbb{Q})$ is empty.

Proof. First we check that the sets A and B are not thin at any point of E (in particular, they are dense in E).

⁽⁹⁾ We shortly say that S does not separate domains.

Indeed, suppose that A is thin at a point $a \in E$. By Remark 2.1(e), there exist a circle $C \subset E$ such that $C \cap A = \emptyset$. Using a Baire category argument, we conclude that there exist a non-empty open arc $\Gamma \subset C$ and an open disc $\Delta \subset E$ such that the 3-dimensional real surface $\Gamma \times \Delta$ is contained in S . Hence, since S is nowhere dense and does not separate domains, we get a contradiction.

Consequently, by Remark 2.1(d), the sets A and B are locally regular and $h_{A,E}^* = h_{B,E}^* = 0$. In particular, $\hat{X} = E \times E$.

Now, using the fact that A and B are dense in E , one can easily check that all the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 ($D = G = E$) are satisfied with arbitrary exhaustions $D_j := \Delta_0(r_j)$, $G_j := \Delta_0(r_j)$, $0 < r_j \nearrow 1$, which satisfy condition (1.4.3). $\square$

Remark 3.3. (a) E. Sakai claims in [Sak 1957] that also the following n -dimensional version of Corollary 3.1 is true. We do not know how to prove it.

Let $S \subset E^n$ be relatively closed such that $\text{int } S = \emptyset$ and S does not separate domains. Let $f : E^n \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be such that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and for any $(a', a'') \in E^{j-1} \times E^{n-j}$ for which $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}} S_{(a', \cdot, a'')} = \emptyset$, the function $f_{(a', \cdot, a'')}$ extends meromorphically to E ⁽¹⁰⁾. Then f extends meromorphically to E^n .

In particular, we would like to ask whether for any set $A \subset E^k$ which is plurithin at $0 \in E^k$ there exists a non-empty relatively open subset Γ of a real hypersurface such that $\Gamma \subset E^k \setminus A$ (cf. the proof of Corollary 3.1).

(b) We also do not know whether the following generalization of Corollary 3.1 is true.

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^p$, $G \subset \mathbb{C}^q$ be pseudoconvex domains and let $S \subset D \times G$ be a relatively closed set such that $\text{int } S = \emptyset$ and S does not separate domains. Let A (resp. B) denote the set of all $a \in D$ (resp. $b \in G$) such that $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}^q} S_{(a, \cdot)} = \emptyset$ (resp. $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}^p} S_{(\cdot, b)} = \emptyset$). Put $X := \mathbb{X}(A, B; D, G) = (A \times G) \cup (D \times B)$. Then for every function $f : X \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is separately meromorphic on X , there exists an $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(D \times G)$ such that $\hat{f} = f$ on $X \setminus S$.

Corollary 3.4 (Cf. [Shi 1989], Th. 2). *Let D, G, A, B, X be as in Theorem 1.4. Assume that $S \subset X$ is a relatively closed set such that*

- *the set $D \setminus A$ is of zero Lebesgue measure,*
- *for every $a \in A$ the fiber $S_{(a, \cdot)}$ is pluripolar,*
- *for every $b \in B$ the fiber $S_{(\cdot, b)}$ is of zero Lebesgue measure.*

Then for every function $f : X \setminus S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which is separately meromorphic on X , there exists an $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(D \times G)$ such that $\hat{f} = f$ on $X \setminus S$.

Proof. One can easily check that all the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 are satisfied (with arbitrary exhaustions satisfying (1.4.3–4)). It remains to observe that $h_{A,D}^* \equiv 0$ (because $h_{A,D}^* = 0$ on A and the set $D \setminus A$ is of zero measure). Hence $\hat{X} = D \times G$. $\square$

⁽¹⁰⁾ That is, f is separately meromorphic on the n -fold generalized cross $T := \mathbb{T}(E, \dots, E; E, \dots, E; S_1, \dots, S_n)$, where S_j denote the set of all $(a', a'') \in E^{j-1} \times E^{n-j}$ for which $\text{int}_{\mathbb{C}} S_{(a', \cdot, a'')} \neq \emptyset$, $j = 1, \dots, n$; cf. Definition 1.2.

4. ROTHSTEIN THEOREM.

Theorem 4.1 (Cf. [Rot 1950]). *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}(E^p \times E^q)$. Assume that $A \subset E^p$ be a locally pluriregular set such that for any $a \in E^p$ we have $(P_f)_{(a,\cdot)} \neq E^q$, where P_f denote the polar set of f , i.e. P_f is the union of the set of all poles of f and the set of all indeterminacy points of f ⁽¹¹⁾. Let $G \subset \mathbb{C}^p$ be a domain such that $E^q \subset G$. Assume that for every $a \in A$ the function $f(a, \cdot)$ extends meromorphically to G . Then there exists an open neighborhood Ω of $(E^p \times E^q) \cup (A \times G)$ and a function $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ such that $\hat{f} = f$ on $E^p \times E^q$.*

We present a sketch of the proof.

(1) The case where $A = E^p$ ⁽¹²⁾, $q = 1$, $G = \Delta_0(R)$ ($R > 1$), and $f \in \mathcal{O}(E^p \times E)$:

The proof may be found for instance in [Siu 1974].

(2) The case where $A = E^p$, $q = 1$, and $G = \Delta_0^q(R)$:

Recall that $(P_f)_{(a,\cdot)} \neq E^q$ for any $a \in E^p$, and therefore, for any $a \in E^p$ there exists a $b \in E^q$ such that f is holomorphic in a neighborhood of (a, b) . By applying locally (1), we get the required result.

(3) The case where $A = E^p$ and $G = \Delta_0^q(R)$:

Let R_0 denote the radius of the maximal polydisc $\Delta_0^q(R_0)$ such that f extends meromorphically to $E^p \times \Delta_0^q(R_0)$. We only need to show that $R_0 \geq R$. Obviously $R_0 \geq 1$. Suppose that $R_0 < R$.

Let S_q be the set of all $(z, w') \in E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0)$ such that $(P_f)_{(z,w',\cdot)} = E$. It is well known that S_q is an analytic subset of $E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0)$. Moreover, our assumptions imply that $S_q \neq E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0)$. Applying locally the Rothstein theorem to $(E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0) \setminus S_q) \times \Delta_0(R) \subset \mathbb{C}^{p+q-1} \times \mathbb{C}$, we conclude that f extends meromorphically to $((E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0) \setminus S_q) \times \Delta_0(R)) \cup (E^p \times \Delta_0^q(R_0))$. Observe that, by the Levi extension theorem ([Jar-Pfl 2000], Prop. 3.4.5), the envelope of holomorphy of $((E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0) \times \Delta_0(R)) \setminus (S_q \times \Delta_0(R))) \cup (E^p \times \Delta_0^q(R_0))$ equals $E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0) \times \Delta_0(R)$. Consequently, the function f extends meromorphically to $E^p \times \Delta_0^{q-1}(R_0) \times \Delta_0(R)$. Repeating the same argument with respect to other variables in $\mathbb{C}^q$, we conclude that f extends meromorphically to the domain $E^p \times H$, where

$$H = \bigcup_{j=1}^q \Delta_0^{j-1}(R_0) \times \Delta_0(R) \times \Delta_0^{q-j}(R_0).$$

The envelope of holomorphy of $E^p \times H$ has the form $E^p \times \hat{H}$, where $\hat{H}$ contains a polydisc $\Delta_0^q(R'_0)$ with $R'_0 > R_0$. Thus f extends meromorphically to $E^p \times \Delta_0^q(R'_0)$; contradiction — cf. the proof of Lemma 12 in [Jar-Pfl 2002b].

⁽¹¹⁾ Note that P_f is analytic and $f \in \mathcal{O}(E^p \times E^q \setminus P_f)$.

⁽¹²⁾ Observe that if $A = E^p$, then we have to prove that f extends meromorphically to $E^p \times G$.

(4) The case where $A \subset E^p$ is locally pluriregular and $G = \Delta_0^q(R)$:

For every $z \in E^p$, let $\rho_f(z)$ denote the radius of the maximal polydisc $\Delta_0^q(r)$ such that $f(z, \cdot)$ extends meromorphically to $\Delta_0^q(r)$. Obviously, $\rho_f \geq 1$ on E^p and $\rho_f \geq R$ on A .

Using (3), one can easily conclude that f extends meromorphically to the Hartogs domain

$$D := \{(z, w) \in E^p \times \mathbb{C}^q : |w| < (\rho_f)_*(z)\}.$$

Let $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{M}(D)$ be the meromorphic extension of f .

Moreover, $-\log(\rho_f)_* \in \mathcal{PSH}(E^p)$.

Indeed, let $\widehat{D}$ denote the envelope of holomorphy of D . It is known that $\widehat{D} \subset E^p \times \mathbb{C}^q$ is a Hartogs domain with complete q -circled fibers ([Jar-Pfl 2000], Remark 3.1.2(h)). Moreover, $\tilde{f}$ extends meromorphically to $\widehat{D}$ ([Jar-Pfl 2000], Th. 3.6.6). In particular,

$$(\rho_f)_*(z) = \inf\{\delta_{\widehat{D},(0,\xi)}(z, 0) : \xi \in \mathbb{C}^q, |\xi| = 1\}, \quad z \in E^p,$$

where

$$\delta_{\widehat{D},(0,\xi)}(z, 0) = \sup\{r > 0 : (z, 0) + \Delta_0(r)(0, \xi) \subset \widehat{D}\}.$$

Consequently, $-\log(\rho_f)_* \in \mathcal{PSH}(E^p)$ ([Jar-Pfl 2000], Th. 2.2.9(iv)).

Thus $-\log(\rho_f)_* \in \mathcal{PSH}(E^p)$. Recall that $\rho_f \geq R$ on A . Hence, using the local pluriregularity of A , we conclude that $(\rho_f)_* \geq R$ on A ⁽¹³⁾. Thus $A \times \Delta_0^q(R) \subset D$, and therefore D is the required neighborhood.

(5) The general case where $A \subset E^p$ is locally pluriregular and G is arbitrary:

Fix an $a \in A$. Let G_0 denote the set of all $b \in G$ such that there exist $r_b > 0$ and $f_b \in \mathcal{M}(\Delta_{(a,b)}(r_b))$, $\Delta_{(a,b)}(r_b) \subset E^p \times G$, such that:

$$\forall \alpha \in A \cap \Delta_a(r_b) : f_b(\alpha, \cdot) = \tilde{f}(\alpha, \cdot) \text{ on } \Delta_b(r_b) \quad (14).$$

Obviously G_0 is open, $G_0 \neq \emptyset$ ($E^q \subset G_0$). Using the Rothstein theorem with $G = \Delta_0^q(R)$, one can prove that G_0 is closed in G . Thus $G_0 = G$.

Moreover, one can also prove that if $\Delta_{b'}(r_{b'}) \cap \Delta_{b''}(r_{b''}) \neq \emptyset$, then $f_{b'} = f_{b''}$ on $\Delta_{(a,b')}(r_{b'}) \cap \Delta_{(a,b'')}(r_{b''})$. This gives a meromorphic extension of f to an open neighborhood of $\{a\} \times G$. Since a was arbitrary, we get the required neighborhood Ω .

The proof of the Rothstein theorem is completed.

⁽¹³⁾ Suppose that $h_{A,E^p}^* = h_{A,E^p}$ on $E^p \setminus P$, where P is pluripolar. Put $u := \frac{-\log(\rho_f)_*}{\log R} + 1$. Then $u \leq 1$ and $u \leq 0$ on $A \setminus P$. Consequently, $u \leq h_{A \setminus P, E^p}^* = h_{A, E^p}^*$. In particular, $u \leq 0$ on A , i.e. $(\rho_f)_* \geq R$ on A .

⁽¹⁴⁾ As before, $\tilde{f}(\alpha, \cdot)$ denotes the meromorphic extension of $f(\alpha, \cdot)$.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3.

Fix a function $f \in \mathcal{M}_s(X \setminus M) \cap \mathcal{O}_s(X \setminus Q_f)$. By Theorem 1.1 there exists exactly one $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{O}(\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{Q}_f)$ with $\widehat{f} = f$ on $X'_f \setminus Q_f$. It remains to prove that $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M})$.

It is sufficient to prove that $\widehat{f} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega \setminus \widehat{M})$, where $\Omega \subset \widehat{X}$ is an open neighborhood of X'_f .

Indeed, by virtue of Lemma 9 from [Jar-Pfl 2002b] and the Chirka theorem (cf. [Chi 1993], see also [Jar-Pfl 2002b], Th. 6), the envelope of holomorphy of $\Omega \setminus \widehat{M}$ coincides with $\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$. Consequently, the function $\widehat{f}$ extends meromorphically to $\widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$ (cf. [Jar-Pfl 2000], Th. 3.6.6).

Fix a $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and a point

$$(a', a'') \in (A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N) \setminus \Sigma_j(Q_f).$$

Take an $a_j \in D_j \setminus (Q_f)_{(a', a'')}$ and let $r > 0$ be such that $\Delta_a(r) \subset \widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{Q}_f$, where $a = (a', a_j, a'')$. Take a $D'_j \Subset D_j \setminus \widehat{M}_{(a', a'')}$ with $a_j \in D'_j$. We may assume that $\Delta_{(a', a'')}(r) \times D'_j \subset \widehat{X} \setminus \widehat{M}$ and $\Delta_{a_j}(r) \subset D'_j$. By the Rothstein theorem 4.1 with $p := n_1 + \dots + n_{j-1} + n_{j+1} + \dots + n_N$, $q := n_j$,

$$A := ((A_1 \times \dots \times A_{j-1}) \times (A_{j+1} \times \dots \times A_N)) \cap \Delta_{(a', a'')}(r),$$

we get an open set $\Omega_a \supset A \times D'_j$ such that $\widehat{f}$ extends meromorphically to Ω_a .

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is completed.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4.

It suffices to prove that for each j there exists an open neighborhood Ω_j of the cross $X_j := \mathbb{X}(A_j, B_j; D_j, G_j) = (A_j \times G_j) \cup (D_j \times B_j)$ such that there exists an $\widetilde{f}_j \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_j)$ with $\widetilde{f}_j = f$ on $X_j \setminus S$.

Indeed, we may assume that $\Omega_j \subset \widehat{X}_j$. Observe that $\widehat{X}_j \nearrow \widehat{X}$. By Lemma 9 from [Jar-Pfl 2002b] the envelope of holomorphy of Ω_j equals $\widehat{X}_j$. Hence, by Theorem 3.6.6 from [Jar-Pfl 2000], the function $\widetilde{f}_j$ extends to a function $\widehat{f}_j \in \mathcal{M}(\widehat{X}_j)$. Since $X_j \setminus S$ is not pluripolar (by (1.4.2)), we conclude that $\widehat{f}_j = \widehat{f}_{j+1}$ on $\widehat{X}_j$. Finally, we glue up the functions $(\widehat{f}_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ and we get the required extension.

Fix $(a, b) \in A_j \times B_j \setminus S$ and let $r > 0$ be such that $\Delta_{(a,b)}(r) \subset D_j \times G_j \setminus S$. Define $Y := \mathbb{X}(A \cap \Delta_a(r), B \cap \Delta_b(r); \Delta_a(r), \Delta_b(r))$. Then $f \in \mathcal{O}_s(Y)$ and hence, by Theorem 1.1, $f|_Y$ extends holomorphically on $\widehat{Y}$. In particular, f extends holomorphically to an open neighborhood of (a, b) .

By the Rothstein theorem 4.1, we get an open set

$$\Omega_{j,a,b} = (\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \times G_j) \cup (D_j \times \Delta_b(r_{a,b})) \subset D_j \times G_j$$

for which there exists a function $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b} \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega_{j,a,b})$ such that $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b} = f$ on $X \cap \Omega_{j,a,b} \setminus S$.

Now we show that if $\Omega_{j,a,b} \cap \Omega_{j,a',b'} \neq \emptyset$, then $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b} = \widehat{f}_{j,a',b'}$ on $\Omega_{j,a,b} \cap \Omega_{j,a',b'}$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{j,a,b} \cap \Omega_{j,a',b'} &= (\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \cap \Delta_{a'}(r_{a',b'})) \times G_j \\ &\quad \cup \Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \times \Delta_{b'}(r_{a',b'}) \\ &\quad \cup \Delta_{a'}(r_{a',b'}) \times \Delta_b(r_{a,b}) \\ &\quad \cup D_j \times (\Delta_b(r_{a,b}) \cap \Delta_{b'}(r_{a',b'})). \end{aligned}$$

First observe that $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b} = f = \widehat{f}_{j,a',b'}$ on $(A_j \times B_j) \cap (\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \times \Delta_{b'}(r_{a',b'})) \setminus S$. Hence, by (1.4.2), $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b} = \widehat{f}_{j,a',b'}$ on $\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \times \Delta_{b'}(r_{a',b'})$. The same argument works on $\Delta_{a'}(r_{a',b'}) \times \Delta_b(r_{a,b})$.

If $\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \cap \Delta_{a'}(r_{a',b'}) \neq \emptyset$, then for any $\beta \in B_j$ we have $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b}(\cdot, \beta) = f(\cdot, \beta)$ on $A_j \cap \Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \setminus S_{(\cdot, \beta)}$. Hence $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b}(\cdot, \beta) = \widehat{f}_{j,a',b'}(\cdot, \beta)$ on $\Delta_a(r_{a,b})$, and, consequently, $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b}(\cdot, \beta) = f(\cdot, \beta) = \widehat{f}_{j,a',b'}(\cdot, \beta)$ on $\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \cap \Delta_{a'}(r_{a',b'})$ for any $\beta \in B_j$. The identity principle implies that $\widehat{f}_{j,a,b} = \widehat{f}_{j,a',b'}$ on $(\Delta_a(r_{a,b}) \cap \Delta_{a'}(r_{a',b'})) \times G_j$. The same argument works on $D_j \times (\Delta_b(r_{a,b}) \cap \Delta_{b'}(r_{a',b'}))$.

It remains to observe that, by (1.4.5), $\Omega_j := \bigcup_{(a,b) \in A_j \times B_j \setminus S} \Omega_{j,a,b}$ is an open neighborhood of X_j .

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is completed.

REFERENCES

- [Arm-Gar 2001] D. H. Armitage, S. J. Gardiner, *Classical Potential Theory*, Springer Verlag 2001.
- [Bed-Tay 1982] E. Bedford, B. A. Taylor, A new capacity for plurisubharmonic functions, *Acta Math.* 149 (1982), 1–40.
- [Chi 1993] E. M. Chirka, *The extension of pluripolar singularity sets*, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* 200 (1993), 369–373.
- [Jar-Pfl 2000] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *Extension of Holomorphic Functions*, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 34, Walter de Gruyter 2000.
- [Jar-Pfl 2002a] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *An extension theorem for separately holomorphic functions with analytic singularities*, *Ann. Pol. Math.* (2002), to appear.
- [Jar-Pfl 2002b] M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, *An extension theorem for separately holomorphic functions with pluripolar singularities*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear.
- [Kaz 1976] M. V. Kazaryan, *On separately meromorphic functions of several complex variables*, *Mat. Sb.* 9 (141) (1976), 538–547.
- [Kaz 1978] M. V. Kazaryan, *On separately meromorphic functions*, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk Arm. SSR* 17 (1978), 69–73.
- [Kaz 1984] M. V. Kazaryan, *Meromorphic continuation with respect to groups of variables*, *Mat. Sb.* 125 (167) (1984), 384–397.
- [Kli 1991] M. Klimek, *Pluripotential Theory*, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- [Rot 1950] W. Rothstein, *Ein neuer Beweis des Hartogsschen Hauptsatzes und seine Ausdehnung auf meromorphe Funktionen*, *Math. Z.* 53 (1950), 84–95.
- [Sak 1957] E. Sakai, *A note on meromorphic functions in several complex variables*, *Memoirs of the Faculty of Science, Kyusyu Univ.* 11 (1957), 75–80.

- [Shi 1986] B. Shiffman, *Complete characterization of holomorphic chains of codimension one*, Math. Ann. 274 (1986), 233–256.
- [Shi 1989] B. Shiffman, *Separate analyticity and Hartogs theorems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 38 (1989), 943–957.
- [Siu 1974] Y. T. Siu, *Techniques of Extension of Analytic Objects*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. 8, Marcel Dekker, 1974.

JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
 REYMONTA 4, 30-059 KRAKÓW, POLAND
E-mail address: `jarnicki@im.uj.edu.pl`

CARL VON OSSIETZKY UNIVERSITÄT OLDENBURG, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK
 POSTFACH 2503, D-26111 OLDENBURG, GERMANY
E-mail address: `pflug@mathematik.uni-oldenburg.de`